

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's September 2, 2003 Official Action and respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following comments.

Claims 1-9 remain in the application for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 on the same basis and prior art cited in his first Office Action. Applicant traverses this rejection on the same basis set out in its June 11, 2003, which Applicant incorporates by reference therein.

The Examiner justifies his rejection by indicating in his remarks on page 4 of the September 2, 2003 Office Action that:

"...the Yu reference has a "plurality of supporting bars engaged in and crossing over the receiving space"

Applicant submits that this statement is incorrect, and unsupportable. Yu does not in anyway teach this claimed structure.

In Yu, the circular shoulder portion 32 circumscribes the two receiving spaces 28 and 30 and cannot be defined as part

of a plurality of supporting bars "each of which is engaged in and crosses over said receiving space" as claimed by Applicant.

Further, the single partition 34 located between the two receiving spaces 28 and 30 does not amount to "a plurality of supporting bars" as claimed. Accordingly, there is absolutely no basis whatever for the Examiner's position that elements 32 and 34 are equivalent to the claimed "plurality of supporting bars".

The Examiner has clearly not anticipated each element in independent claim 1 and especially the "plurality of supporting bars" set out in that claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 1-3 be withdrawn.

Applicant further submits that Morrow does not teach the structure as set out in claims 1-3 or that of claims 6-9. Morrow discloses a saddle that has a netting f attached to a leather seat F so as to prevent the leather seat F from stretching. Clearly, the netting f and the leather seat F are not interconnected in the manner claimed as the hollow of the netting are not filled by the leather seat F.

The elastic body of the claimed invention is bonded to the periphery of the receiving space and to the supporting bars by moulding, which interconnects the supporting bars and the elastic body fills the hollow of the supporting bars.


Accordingly, Applicant submits that there is no teaching or incentive to substitute the netting of Morrow for the single support bar 34 of Yu (it being established above that the shoulder portions 32 of Yu are not support bars which are engaged in and cross over the receiving space).

Applicant requests that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn as being obviously incorrect and unsupportable. If the Examiner does not agree, Applicant requests a telephone conference with the Examiner and his supervisor prior to any further action.

Applicant submits that the invention is new and unobvious and not disclosed by the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner's early review and issuance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ft
G:\BN\D\dire\yu39\pto\Amendment 2Dec03.doc
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528